arXiv:1611.05585v1 [math.MG] 17 Nov 2016

EXACT CONVERGENCE ORDER OF THE L_r-QUANTIZATION ERROR FOR MARKOV-TYPE MEASURES

SANGUO ZHU, YOUMING ZHOU, YONGJIAN SHENG

ABSTRACT. Let E be a graph-directed set associated with a di-graph G. Let μ be a Markov-type measure on E. Assuming a separation condition for E, we determine the exact convergence order of the L_r-quantization error for μ. This result provides us with accurate information on the asymptotics of the quantization error, especially when the quantization coefficient is infinite.

1. INTRODUCTION

The quantization problem for probability measures consists in nonlinear approximation of a given probability measure with discrete measures in L_r-metrics. We refer to [3] for mathematical foundations of this theory and [1, 6, 12] for its deep background in information theory and engineering technology. One may see [11] for some more related theoretical results.

In the present paper, we further study the asymptotic quantization errors for Markov-type measures supported on graph-directed fractals. For related results on this topic, see [7, 9].

Let $P = (p_{ij})_{N\times N}$ be a row-stochastic matrix, i.e, $p_{ij} \geq 0, 1 \leq i, j \leq N$, and $\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_{ij} = 1, 1 \leq i \leq N$. We assume

$$\text{card}(\{1 \leq j \leq N : p_{ij} > 0\}) \geq 2 \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq N. \tag{1.1}$$

Let θ denote the empty word and set $\Omega_0 := \{\theta\}$. Write

$$\Omega_1 := \{1, \ldots N\};\ \Omega_k := \left\{\sigma \in \Omega_1^k : \prod_{h=1}^{k-1} p_{\sigma_h\sigma_{h+1}} > 0\right\},\ k \geq 2;$$

$$\Omega^* := \bigcup_{k\geq 0} \Omega_k,\ \Omega_\infty := \left\{\sigma \in \Omega_1^{\mathbb{N}} : p_{\sigma_h\sigma_{h+1}} > 0 \text{ for all } h \geq 1\right\}.$$

We define $|\sigma| := k$ for $\sigma \in \Omega_k$ and $|\theta| := 0$. For $\sigma = \sigma_1 \ldots \sigma_n \in \Omega_n$ with $n \geq k$ or $\sigma \in \Omega_\infty$, we write $\sigma|_k := \sigma_1 \ldots \sigma_k$. If $\sigma, \omega \in \Omega^*$ and $(\sigma_{|\sigma|}, \omega_1) \in \Omega_2$, we define

$$\sigma * \omega = \sigma_1\sigma_2 \ldots \sigma_{|\sigma|}\omega_1 \ldots \omega_{|\omega|} \in \Omega_{|\sigma|+|\omega|}.$$

Let $J_i, 1 \leq i \leq N$, be non-empty compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^t$ with $J_i = \overline{\text{int}(J_i)}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N$, where $\overline{B}$ and $\text{int}(B)$ respectively denote the closure and interior in $\mathbb{R}^t$ of a set $B \subset \mathbb{R}^t$. Let $|A|$ denotes the diameter of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^t$. Without loss of generality, we assume that

$$|J_i| = 1 \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq N.$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 28A80, 28A78.

Key words and phrases. Markov-type measures, graph directed fractals, quantization error, convergence order, reducible transition matrix.

Let $(c_{ij})_{N\times N}$ be a non-negative matrix such that $c_{ij}\in[0,1)$, and $c_{ij}>0$ if and only if $p_{ij}>0$ for all $1\le i,j\le N$.

We call $J_i, 1\le i\le N$, cylinder sets of order one. For each $1\le i\le N$, let $J_{ij},\ (i,j)\in\Omega_2$, be non-overlapping subsets of J_i such that J_{ij} is geometrically similar to J_j and

$$\frac{|J_{ij}|}{|J_j|}=c_{ij},\ (i,j)\in\Omega_2.$$

We call these sets cylinder sets of order two.

Assume that cylinder sets $J_\sigma,\sigma\in\Omega_k$, of order k are defined. Let $J_{\sigma*i_{k+1}}$ with $\sigma*i_{k+1}\in\Omega_{k+1}$, be non-overlapping subsets of J_σ such that $J_{\sigma*i_{k+1}}$ is geometrically similar to $J_{i_{k+1}}$ and

$$\frac{|J_{\sigma*i_{k+1}}|}{|J_\sigma|}=c_{\sigma_{|\sigma|}i_{k+1}}.$$

Inductively, cylinder sets of order k are determined for all $k\ge1$. Then we get a ratio-specified fractal set E satisfying

$$E:=\bigcap_{k\ge1}\bigcup_{\sigma\in\Omega_k}J_\sigma.$$

This type of sets can be described in terms of directed graphs, so we call E a graph-directed set. Fractal properties of such sets, including Hausdorff dimension and Hausdorff measure, have been well studied by Mauldin and Williams [10], Edgar and Mauldin [2].

Let $(\chi_i)_{i=1}^N$ be an arbitrary probability vector with $\min_{1\le i\le N}\chi_i>0$. By Kolmogorov consistency theorem, there exists a unique probability measure $\widetilde{\mu}$ on Ω_∞ such that for every $k\ge1$ and $\sigma=\sigma_1\dots\sigma_k\in\Omega_k$, we have

$$\widetilde{\mu}([\sigma]):=\chi_{\sigma_1}p_{\sigma_1\sigma_2}\cdots p_{\sigma_{k-1}\sigma_k};$$

where $[\sigma]:=\{\omega\in\Omega_\infty:\omega|_{|\sigma|}=\sigma\}$. Let π denote the projection from Ω_∞ to E:

$$\pi(\sigma)=x,\ \text{ with }\ \{x\}:=\bigcap_{k\ge1}J_{\sigma|_k},\ \text{ for }\ \sigma\in\Omega_\infty.$$

As in [7], we assume that there exists some constant $t\in(0,1)$ such that

$$d(J_{\sigma*i_1},J_{\sigma*i_2})\ge t\max\{|J_{\sigma*i_1}|,|J_{\sigma*i_2}|\} \tag{1.2}$$

for every $\sigma\in\Omega^*$ and distinct $i_1,i_2\in\Omega_1$ with $(\sigma_{|\sigma|},i_l)\in\Omega_2, l=1,2$. We call the measure $\mu:=\widetilde{\mu}\circ\pi^{-1}$ a Markov-type measure which satisfies

$$\mu(J_\sigma)=\chi_{\sigma_1}p_{\sigma_1\sigma_2}\cdots p_{\sigma_{k-1}\sigma_k}\ \text{ for }\ \sigma=\sigma_1\dots\sigma_k\in\Omega_k. \tag{1.3}$$

Next, let us recall some objects in quantization theory. We set

$$\mathcal{D}_n:=\{\alpha\subset\mathbb{R}^t:1\le\operatorname{card}(\alpha)\le n\},\ \ n\in\mathbb{N}.$$

Let ν be a Borel probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^t$. For each $n\ge1$, the nth quantization error for ν of order r is defined by

$$e_{n,r}(\nu):=\left(\inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{D}_n}\int d(x,\alpha)^r\,d\nu(x)\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}, \tag{1.4}$$

where $d(x,\alpha):=\inf_{a\in\alpha}d(x,a)$ and d is the metric induced by a norm on $\mathbb{R}^t$. For $r\ge1$, $e_{n,r}(\nu)$ agrees with the error in the approximation of ν by discrete probability measures supported on at most n points, in L_r-metrics [3].

The upper and lower quantization dimension for ν of order r as defined below are natural characterizations of the convergence rate of $e_{n,r}(\nu)$:

$$\overline{D}_r(\nu) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log n}{-\log e_{n,r}(\nu)},\ \underline{D}_r(\nu) := \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log n}{-\log e_{n,r}(\nu)}.$$

If $\overline{D}_r(\nu) = \underline{D}_r(\nu)$, we denote the common value by $D_r(\nu)$ and call it the quantization dimension for ν of order r.

For $s > 0$, we define the s-dimensional upper and lower quantization coefficient for ν of order r by

$$\overline{Q}_r^s(\nu) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} n^{\frac{r}{s}} e_{n,r}^r(\nu),\ \ \underline{Q}_r^s(\nu) := \liminf_{n\to\infty} n^{\frac{r}{s}} e_{n,r}^r(\nu).$$

The upper (lower) quantization dimension is the critical point at which the upper (lower) quantization coefficient jumps from zero to infinity [3, 11]. When $\underline{Q}_r^s(\nu)$ and $\overline{Q}_r^s(\nu)$ are both positive and finite, one can easily see that $e_{n,r}^r(\nu)$ is of the same order as $n^{-\frac{r}{s}}$.

In the remaining part of this section, we recall some concepts regarding digraphs and some previous work in [7]; then we state our main result of the present paper.

Let G be a directed graph with vertices $1, 2, \ldots, N$; we assume that there exists exactly one edge from i to j if and only if $p_{ij} > 0$; otherwise there is no edge from i to j. As in [7], we denote by $G = \{1, \ldots, N\}$ both the directed graph and its vertex set. We write

$$b_{ij}(s) := (p_{ij} c_{ij}^r)^{\frac{s}{s+r}},\ \ A_G(s) := (b_{ij}(s))_{N\times N}.$$

Let $\Psi_G(s)$ denote the spectral radius of $A_G(s)$. As we noted in [7], there exists a unique positive number s_r such that $\Psi_G(s_r) = 1$.

An element $i_1 \ldots i_k \in \Omega_k$ is called a path in G. We call $H \subset G$, with edges inherited from G, a subgraph of G. A subgraph H of G is called strongly connected if for very pair $i_1, i_2 \in H$, there exists a path γ in H which starts at i_1 and terminates at i_2. A strongly connected component of G means a maximal strongly connected subgraph. We denote by $\mathrm{SC}(G)$ the set of all strongly connected components of G.

For $H_1, H_2 \in \mathrm{SC}(G)$, we write $H_1 \prec H_2$, if there is a path $\gamma = i_1 \ldots i_k$ in G such that $i_1 \in H_1$ and $i_k \in H_2$. If neither $H_1 \prec H_2$ nor $H_2 \prec H_1$, then we say that H_1, H_2 are incomparable.

For $H \in \mathrm{SC}(G)$, we denote by $A_H(s)$ the sub-matrix $(b_{ij}(s))_{i,j\in H}$ of $A_G(s)$. Let $\Psi_H(s)$ be the spectral radius of $A_H(s)$ and $s_r(H)$ be the unique positive number satisfying $\Psi_H(s_r(H)) = 1$. By [7], we have

$$s_r = \max_{H\in SC(G)} s_r(H).$$

For every $r \in (0, \infty)$, we write

$$\mathcal{M}_r := \{H \in \mathrm{SC}(G) : s_r(H) = s_r\},\ M_r := \mathrm{card}(\mathcal{M}_r).$$

Assume that (1.1) and (1.2) are satisfied. Let μ be as defined in (1.3). It is proved in [7] that

(a) $D_r(\mu) = s_r$ and $\underline{Q}_r^{s_r}(\mu) > 0$;

(b) $\overline{Q}_r^{s_r}(\mu) < \infty$ if and only if elements of $\mathcal{M}_r$ are pairwise incomparable; otherwise, we have $\underline{Q}_r^{s_r}(\mu) = \infty$.

When G is strongly connected, Lindsay determined the quantization dimension in terms of the temperature function of the corresponding dynamical systems and proved that the upper and lower quantization coefficient are positive and finite [9].

For two sequences $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of positive numbers, we write $a_n \lesssim b_n$ if there is some constant B independent of n such that $a_n \le B \cdot b_n$. If $a_n \lesssim b_n$ and $b_n \lesssim a_n$ we write $a_n \asymp b_n$. Then, if $\mathcal{M}_r$ consists of incomparable elements, by (a) and (b), the convergence order of $e^r_{n,r}(\mu)$ is known:

$$e^r_{n,r}(\mu) \asymp n^{-\frac{r}{s_r}}. \tag{1.5}$$

When $\mathcal{M}_r$ contains comparable elements, by (b), we have that $\underline{Q}^{s_r}_r(\mu) = \infty$. However, this does not provide us with accurate information on the asymptotics of the quantization error for μ. As our main result of the paper, we will determine the exact asymptotic order of $e^r_{n,r}(\mu)$ in case that $\underline{Q}^{s_r}_r(\mu) = \infty$. For a path $\gamma = \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{|\gamma|} \in \Omega_{|\gamma|}$, we define

$$T_r(\gamma) := \text{card}(\{H \in \mathcal{M}_r : \gamma_i \in H \ \text{ for some } \ i\}).$$

Clearly, $0 \le T_r(\gamma) \le M_r$ for all $\gamma \in \Omega^*$. Set $T_r := \max_{\gamma\in\Omega^*} T_r(\gamma)$. Then we have $1 \le T_r \le M_r$. We will prove

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that (1.1) and (1.2) are satisfied and let μ be the Markov-type measure as defined in (1.3). We have*

$$e^r_{n,r}(\mu) \asymp n^{-\frac{r}{s_r}} \cdot (\log n)^{(T_r-1)(1+\frac{r}{s_r})}. \tag{1.6}$$

If $T_r = 1$, then $\mathcal{M}_r$ consists of incomparable elements and (1.6) degenerates to (1.5). Hence, we assume that $T_r \ge 2$ in the remaining part of the paper.

2. Preliminaries

For every $k \ge 2$ and $\sigma = \sigma_1 \ldots \sigma_k \in \Omega_k$, we write

$$\sigma^- := \sigma|_{k-1}; \ \ p_\sigma := \prod_{h=1}^{k-1} p_{\sigma_h\sigma_{h+1}}, \ c_\sigma := \prod_{h=1}^{k-1} c_{\sigma_h\sigma_{h+1}}.$$

If $|\sigma| = 1$, we set $\sigma^- = \theta$; we also define $p_\sigma := 1, c_\sigma := 1$ for $\sigma \in \Omega_1 \cup \{\theta\}$. If $\sigma, \omega \in \Omega^*$ satisfy $|\sigma| \le |\omega|$ and $\sigma = \omega|_{|\sigma|}$, then we write $\sigma \prec \omega$. We say that two words $\sigma, \omega \in \Omega^*$ are incomparable if neither $\sigma \prec \omega$, nor $\omega \prec \sigma$. We call a finite subset Γ of Ω^* a finite antichain if Γ consists of pairwise incomparable words; a finite antichain Γ is said to be maximal, if for every word $\tau \in \Omega_\infty$, there exists some word $\sigma \in \Gamma$ such that $\sigma \prec \tau$. Set

$$\underline{p} := \min_{(i,j)\in\Omega_2} p_{ij}, \ \underline{c} := \min_{(i,j)\in\Omega_2} c_{ij}, \ \overline{p} := \max_{(i,j)\in\Omega_2} p_{ij}, \ \overline{c} := \max_{(i,j)\in\Omega_2} c_{ij}.$$

For $r > 0$, let $\underline{\eta}_r := \underline{p}\underline{c}^r$. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\Lambda_{k,r} := \{\sigma \in \Omega^* : p_{\sigma^-} c^r_{\sigma^-} \ge \underline{\eta}^k_r > p_\sigma c^r_\sigma\}; \ \phi_{k,r} := \text{card}(\Lambda_{k,r}). \tag{2.1}$$

Then $(\Lambda_{k,r})_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of finite maximal antichains. Write

$$l_{1k} := \min_{\sigma\in\Lambda_{k,r}} |\sigma|, \ l_{2k} := \max_{\sigma\in\Lambda_{k,r}} |\sigma|, \ k \ge 1.$$

With Lemma 2.2 in [7], we have showed that

$$e^r_{\phi_{k,r},r}(\mu) \asymp \sum_{\sigma\in\Lambda_{k,r}} p_\sigma c^r_\sigma. \tag{2.2}$$

We will also need the following estimates of the order of l_{1k}, l_{2k} and $\log \phi_{k,r}$:

Lemma 2.1. *For every $r > 0$, we have*

$$l_{1k}, l_{2k} \asymp k \text{ and } \log \phi_{k,r} \asymp k. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. Set $\overline{\eta}_r := \overline{pc}^r$. By (2.1), one can easily see that

$$\underline{\eta}_r^{l_{1k}-1} \le \underline{\eta}_r^k \le \overline{\eta}_r^{l_{2k}-2}. \tag{2.4}$$

This implies that $l_{1k}, l_{2k} \asymp k$. To see the remaining part of the lemma, for every $k \ge 1$, let $t_{k,r}$ be the unique positive number satisfying

$$\sum_{\sigma\in\Lambda_{k,r}} (p_\sigma c_\sigma^r)^{\frac{t_{k,r}}{t_{k,r}+r}} = 1.$$

By the definitions in (2.1), we have

$$\phi_{k,r}\underline{\eta}_r^{\frac{(k+1)t_{k,r}}{t_{k,r}+r}} \le 1 \le \phi_{k,r}\underline{\eta}_r^{\frac{kt_{k,r}}{t_{k,r}+r}}, \ \ k \ge 1; \tag{2.5}$$

$$\underline{\eta}_r^{\frac{kr}{t_{k,r}+r}}\underline{\eta}_r \le \underline{\eta}_r^{\frac{(k+1)r}{t_{k,r}+r}} \le (p_\sigma c_\sigma^r)^{\frac{r}{t_{k,r}+r}} \le \underline{\eta}_r^{\frac{kr}{t_{k,r}+r}}, \ \ \sigma \in \Lambda_{k,r}. \tag{2.6}$$

Using (2.2), (2.5) and (2.6), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} e^r_{\phi_{k,r},r}(\mu) &\asymp \sum_{\sigma\in\Lambda_{k,r}} p_\sigma c_\sigma^r = \sum_{\sigma\in\Lambda_{k,r}} (p_\sigma c_\sigma^r)^{\frac{t_{k,r}}{t_{k,r}+r}} (p_\sigma c_\sigma^r)^{\frac{r}{t_{k,r}+r}} \\ &\asymp \underline{\eta}_r^{\frac{kr}{t_{k,r}+r}} \asymp \phi_{k,r}^{-\frac{r}{t_{k,r}}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Hence, $t_{k,r}$ converges to $D_r(\mu) = s_r$ as $k \to \infty$. Thus for large k, we have

$$\frac{s_r}{2} \le t_{k,r} \le 2s_r \text{ and } \xi_r := \frac{s_r}{s_r+2r} \le \frac{t_{k,r}}{t_{k,r}+r} \le \frac{2s_r}{2s_r+r} =: \zeta_r.$$

By this and (2.5), we deduce that $1 \le \phi_{k,r}\underline{\eta}_r^{k\xi_r}$ and $\phi_{k,r}\underline{\eta}_r^{k\zeta_r} \le \underline{\eta}_r^{-\zeta_r}$.

$$k(\xi_r \log \underline{\eta}_r^{-1}) \le \log \phi_{k,r} \le k\zeta_r \log \underline{\eta}_r^{-1} + \zeta_r \log \underline{\eta}_r^{-1} \le k(2\zeta_r \log \underline{\eta}_r^{-1})$$

for large k. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Next we recall some notations and basic facts related to strongly connected components of G. For every $H \in \mathrm{SC}(G)$, we write $H^* := \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty H^k$ and

$$H_k(i) := \left\{\sigma \in H^k : \sigma_1 = i\right\}, \ H^*(i) := \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty H_k(i); \ i \in H.$$

Maximal antichains in H^* or $H^*(i)$ are defined in the same manner as we did for those in Ω^*. By Lemma 3.5 in [7], there exist constants M_0, M_1 such that

$$M_0 \le \sum_{\sigma\in\Gamma} (p_\sigma c_\sigma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} \le M_1. \tag{2.8}$$

for every $H \in \mathcal{M}_r$ and every finite maximal antichain Γ in H^* or $H^*(i)$.

For $k \ge 1$ and a vector $w = (w_i)_{i=1}^k \in \mathbb{R}^k$, we define

$$\overline{w} := \max_{1\le i\le k} w_i, \ \underline{w} := \min_{1\le i\le k} w_i. \tag{2.9}$$

For $H \in \mathcal{M}_r$, denote by $c_{ij}^{(h)}(H)$ the (i,j)-entry of A^h_{H,s_r}. We have

Lemma 2.2. *There exist constants C_1, C_2 such that for $h \geq 1$, we have*

$$C_1 \leq \sum_{j\in H} c_{jp}^{(h)}(H) \leq C_2, \ \text{ for } \ H \in \mathcal{M}_r \ \text{ and } \ p \in H.$$

Proof. Assume that $H \in \mathcal{M}_r$ and $\mathrm{card}(H) = m$. H is strongly connected, so A_{H,s_r} is irreducible. Let $\xi_H = (\xi_{H,i})_{i=1}^m$ be the unique normalized positive left eigenvector of A_{H,s_r} with respect to Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue 1. Then

$$\xi_H A_{H,s_r}^h = \xi_H, \ \text{ implying } \ \sum_{j\in H} \xi_{H,j} c_{jp}^{(h)}(H) = \xi_{H,p}.$$

Hence, using the notations in (3.10), we have

$$\underline{\xi_H}/\overline{\xi_H} \leq \sum_{j\in H} c_{jp}^{(h)}(H) \leq \overline{\xi_H}/\underline{\xi_H}.$$

It suffices to set $C_1 := \min_{H\in\mathcal{M}_r} \underline{\xi_H}/\overline{\xi_H}$ and $C_2 := \max_{H\in\mathcal{M}_r} \overline{\xi_H}/\underline{\xi_H}$. □

Let $F := G \setminus \bigcup_{H\in\mathcal{M}_r} H$. It may happen that $F = \emptyset$. If $F \neq \emptyset$, we set

$$F_k := \{\sigma \in \Omega_k : \sigma_h \in F, 1 \leq h \leq k\}, \ k \geq 1; \ \ F^* := \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} F_k.$$

Lemma 2.3. *([7, Lemma 3.8]) There exists a constant $t \in (0,1)$ such that*

$$\sum_{\sigma\in F_n} (p_\sigma c_\sigma^r)^{s_r/(s_r+r)} \lesssim t^n \ \text{ for large } \ n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

As a consequence, we have $\sum_{\sigma\in F^*} (p_\sigma c_\sigma^r)^{s_r/(s_r+r)} \lesssim 1$.

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

For $\gamma \in \Omega^*$, we have either $T_r(\gamma) = 0$, which implies that γ does not pass any $H \in \mathcal{M}_r$, or $T_r(\gamma) = l$ for some $1 \leq l \leq T_r$. In the latter case, there exist some $H_i \in \mathcal{M}_r, 1 \leq i \leq l$, such that $H_1 \prec H_2 \prec \cdots \prec H_l$. We write

$$\mathcal{H}_l := \{(H_1, H_2, \cdots, H_l) : H_1 \prec H_2 \prec \cdots \prec H_l, H_i \in \mathcal{M}_r, 1 \leq i \leq l\}.$$

By the strong connectedness of $H_i \in \mathcal{M}_r$, we can see that

$$0 \leq \mathrm{card}(\mathcal{H}_l) \leq \binom{T_r}{l} \ \text{ for all } \ 1 \leq l \leq T_r, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\binom{T_r}{l}$ denotes the combination number of choosing l objects out of T_r.

If a path γ passes $H_1, \cdots, H_l \in \mathcal{M}_r$ and $T_r(\gamma) = l$, γ takes the following form:

$$\gamma = \tau_\gamma^{(0)} * \sigma_\gamma^{(1)} * \tau_\gamma^{(1)} * \sigma_\gamma^{(2)} * \cdots * \tau_\gamma^{(l-1)} * \sigma_\gamma^{(l)} * \tau_\gamma^{(l)}, \tag{3.2}$$

where $\tau^{(i)} \in \mathcal{F}^*, 0 \leq i \leq l$, and $\sigma^{(i)} \in H_i \in \mathcal{M}_r, 1 \leq i \leq l$. Let us denote by $\Gamma(H_1, \cdots, H_l)$ the set of all such words γ, which have entries in each of $H_1, \cdots, H_l$, but do not have entries in any other elements of $\mathcal{M}_r$. We write

$$\Lambda_{k,r}(H_1, \cdots, H_l) := \Lambda_{k,r} \cap \Gamma(H_1, \cdots, H_l).$$

Then for large k, $\Lambda_{k,r}(H_1, \cdots, H_l)$ is non-empty. We write

$$\lambda_{k,r}((H_i)_{i=1}^l) := \sum_{\gamma\in\Lambda_{k,r}(H_1,\cdots,H_l)} (p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}. \tag{3.3}$$

For the proof of Theorem 1.1, we need to estimate the asymptotic order of $\lambda_{k,r}((H_i)_{i=1}^l)$. We divide the estimation into several lemmas. First we give an upper estimate for $\lambda_{k,r}((H_i)_{i=1}^l)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\lambda_{k,r}((H_i)_{i=1}^l)$ be as defined in (3.3). For $2 \le l \le T_r$, we have*

$$\lambda_{k,r}((H_i)_{i=1}^l) \lesssim k^{l-1}.$$

Proof. Fix a $\gamma \in \Lambda_{k,r}(H_1, \cdots, H_l)$ of the form (3.2). We may assume that

$$\mathrm{card}(H_i) = m_i,\ 1 \le i \le l.$$

Let $g_{pq}(i)$ be the (p,q)-entry of the matrix $A_{H_i,s_r}^{|\sigma_\gamma^{(i)}|-1}$ when $|\sigma_\gamma^{(i)}| \ge 2$. We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l} |\sigma_\gamma^{(i)}| \le l_{2k} - \sum_{i=0}^{l} |\gamma^{(i)}| \le l_{2k}. \tag{3.4}$$

For each $1 \le i \le l$, we denote by c_i, d_i the first and last entry of the word $\sigma_\gamma^{(i)}$. By Lemma 2.2, for every $h \ge 2$, we have

$$\sum_{|\sigma_\gamma^{(i)}|=h} (p_{\sigma_\gamma^{(i)}} c_{\sigma_\gamma^{(i)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} = g_{c_i d_i}(i) \le \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} g_{j d_i}(i) \le C_2. \tag{3.5}$$

If $|\sigma_\gamma^{(i)}| = 1$, we have $(p_{\sigma_\gamma^{(i)}} c_{\sigma_\gamma^{(i)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} = 1$.

Now we fix $\tau^{(i)} \in \mathcal{F}^*, 0 \le i \le l$; and $c_i, d_i \in H_i, 1 \le i \le l$. We denote by $\Lambda_{k,r}^{(1)}(H_1, \cdots, H_l)$ the set of words γ in $\Lambda_{k,r}(H_1, \cdots, H_l)$ such that

$$\tau_\gamma^{(i)} = \tau^{(i)},\ 0 \le i \le l;\ \ (\sigma_\gamma^{(i)})_1 = c_i,\ \ (\sigma_\gamma^{(i)})_{|\sigma_\gamma^{(i)}|} = d_i,\ \ 1 \le i \le l.$$

Let $I_{k,r}^{(1)}$ be the set of all $(\sigma^{(1)}, \ldots, \sigma^{(l-1)})$ such that for some

$$\gamma \in \Lambda_{k,r}^{(1)}(H_1, \cdots, H_l),$$

$\sigma_\gamma^{(i)} = \sigma^{(i)}, 1 \le i \le l-1$. We further fix $(\sigma^{(1)}, \ldots, \sigma^{(l-1)}) \in I_{k,r}^{(1)}$, and write

$$\Lambda_{k,r}^{(2)}(H_1, \cdots, H_l) := \{\gamma \in \Lambda_{k,r}^{(1)}(H_1, \cdots, H_l) : \sigma_\gamma^{(i)} = \sigma^{(i)}, 1 \le i \le l-1\}.$$

We denote by $D_{k,r}$ the set of the corresponding $\sigma_\gamma^{(l)}$, namely,

$$D_{k,r} := \{\sigma \in H_l^* : \gamma \in \Lambda_{k,r}^{(2)}(H_1, \cdots, H_l), \sigma_\gamma^{(l)} = \sigma\}. \tag{3.6}$$

Then by the proof of Proposition 3.9 of [7], $D_{k,r}$ is contained in the union of M_2 finite maximal antichains in $H_l^*(d_l)$, where

$$M_2 := \inf\left\{h \in \mathbb{N} : (\overline{p}\,\overline{c}^r)^h < \underline{\eta}\right\} + 1.$$

Thus, by (2.8), for $M_3 := M_1 M_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\gamma \in \Lambda_{k,r}^{(2)}(H_1, \cdots, H_l)} (p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} \\
&\le \prod_{i=0}^{l} (p_{\tau^{(i)}} c_{\tau^{(i)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} (p_{\sigma^{(i)}} c_{\sigma^{(i)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} \sum_{\gamma \in D_{k,r}} (p_{\sigma_\gamma^{(l)}} c_{\sigma_\gamma^{(l)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} \\
&\le M_3 \prod_{i=0}^{l} (p_{\tau^{(i)}} c_{\tau^{(i)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} (p_{\sigma^{(i)}} c_{\sigma^{(i)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Note that $1 \le |\sigma_\gamma^{(i)}| \le l_{2k}$ for all $1 \le i \le l$. Hence, by (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{(\sigma^{(1)},\dots,\sigma^{(l-1)})\in I_{k,r}^{(1)}}\prod_{i=1}^{l-1}(p_{\sigma^{(i)}}c_{\sigma^{(i)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\\&\le\prod_{i=1}^{l-1}\sum_{h=1}^{l_{2k}}\sum_{|\sigma^{(i)}|=h}(p_{\sigma^{(i)}}c_{\sigma^{(i)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\le\prod_{i=1}^{l-1}\sum_{h=1}^{l_{2k}}g_{c_id_i}^{(h)}\le(l_{2k}\widetilde{C}_2)^{l-1},\end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{C}_2 := \max\{C_2, 1\}$. Using this and (3.7), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\gamma\in\Lambda_{k,r}^{(1)}(H_1,\cdots,H_l)}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\\&=\sum_{(\sigma^{(1)},\dots,\sigma^{(l-1)})\in I_{k,r}^{(1)}}\ \sum_{\gamma\in\Lambda_{k,r}^{(2)}(H_1,\cdots,H_l)}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\\&\le M_3\prod_{i=0}^{l}(p_{\tau^{(i)}}c_{\tau^{(i)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\sum_{(\sigma^{(1)},\dots,\sigma^{(l-1)})\in I_{k,r}^{(1)}}\prod_{i=1}^{l-1}(p_{\sigma^{(i)}}c_{\sigma^{(i)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\\&\le M_3\widetilde{C}_2^{l-1}l_{2k}^{l-1}\prod_{i=0}^{l}(p_{\tau^{(i)}}c_{\tau^{(i)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.8}$$

Let $I_{k,r}^{(0)}$ denote the set of all possible $(\tau^{(0)},\dots,\tau^{(l)})$ such that $H_i, 1 \le i \le l$, are connected via $\tau^{(i)}, 0 \le i \le l$ (cf. (3.2)). Note that the number of possible choices of $(c_i, d_i), 1 \le i \le l$, is bounded from above by N^{2l}. Using this and (3.8), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{k,r}((H_i)_{i=1}^l) &= \sum_{\gamma\in\Lambda_{k,r}(H_1,\cdots,H_l)}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\\&\le N^{2l}\sum_{(\tau^{(0)},\dots,\tau^{(l)})\in I_{k,r}^{(0)}}\ \sum_{\gamma\in\Lambda_{k,r}^{(1)}(H_1,\cdots,H_l)}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\\&\le N^{2l}M_3\widetilde{C}_2^{l-1}\cdot l_{2k}^{l-1}\sum_{(\tau^{(0)},\dots,\tau^{(l)})\in I_{k,r}^{(0)}}\prod_{i=0}^{l}(p_{\tau^{(i)}}c_{\tau^{(i)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\\&\le N^{2l}M_3\widetilde{C}_2^{l-1}\cdot l_{2k}^{l-1}\bigg(\sum_{\gamma\in F^*}(p_\tau c_\tau^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\bigg)^{l+1}.\end{aligned}$$

This, together with Lemmas 2.3, 2.1, implies

$$\lambda_{k,r}((H_i)_{i=1}^l) \lesssim l_{2k}^{l-1} \asymp k^{l-1}.$$

□

Next, we give a lower estimate for $\lambda_{k,r}((H_i)_{i=1}^l)$. For $2 \le l \le T_r$, let

$$q_1 := l_{1k} - 3lN - 1.\tag{3.9}$$

For $0 \le p_1 \le q_1$, we define $q_2 := q_1 - p_1$. Then for $0 \le p_2 \le q_2$, we set $q_3 := q_2 - p_2$. When p_h, q_h are determined for all $1 \le h \le i-1 \le l-1$, we set

$$q_i := q_{i-1} - p_{i-1} = q_1 - \sum_{h=1}^{i-1} p_h.\tag{3.10}$$

Then p_i is allowed to take values in $[0, q_i] \cap \mathbb{N}$. Note that, for every $2 \le i \le l-1$, q_i is dependent upon the choices of $p_h, 1 \le h \le i-1$.

Lemma 3.2. *For $l \ge 2$ and large k, we have*

$$\sum_{p_1=0}^{q_1} \sum_{p_2=0}^{q_2} \cdots \sum_{p_{l-1}=0}^{q_{l-1}} 1 \gtrsim k^{l-1}. \tag{3.11}$$

Proof. The sum on the left of (3.11) equals a combination number. We can think of this as follows. We distribute q_1 objects among l (not $l-1$) people, allowing that some people have no objects. The number all possible ways of such divisions is not less than $\binom{q_1}{l-1}$. Thus, by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\sum_{p_1=0}^{q_1} \sum_{p_2=0}^{q_2} \cdots \sum_{p_{l-1}=0}^{q_{l-1}} 1 \ge \binom{q_1}{l-1} \gtrsim l_{1k}^{l-1} \asymp k^{l-1}. \tag{3.12}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\lambda_{k,r}((H_i)_{i=1}^l)$ be as defined in (3.3). For $2 \le l \le T_r$, we have*

$$\lambda_{k,r}((H_i)_{i=1}^l) \gtrsim k^{l-1}. \tag{3.13}$$

Proof. Since $H_i \prec H_{i+1}$ for $1 \le i \le l-1$, we may fix

$$\tau^{(i)} \in F^* \text{ with } |\tau^{(i)}| \le N \text{ and } a_i \in H_i,\ b_i \in H_{i+1},$$

such that $a_i * \tau^{(i)} * b_i$ is a path traveling from H_i to H_{i+1}.

Since H_{i+1} is strongly connected, we may fix words $\rho^{(i+1)}(j), j \in H_{i+1}$, such that $|\rho^{(i+1)}(j)| < N$, and $b_i * \rho^{(i+1)}(j) * j$ is a path from b_i to j. We set

$$\mathcal{A}_{i+1} := \{b_i * \rho^{(i+1)}(j) * j : j \in H_{i+1}\},\ 1 \le i \le l-2.$$

In order to show (3.13), we first construct a subset $J_{k,r}$ of $\Lambda_{k,r}(H_1, \ldots, H_l)$. We consider the set E_q of words in Ω_q of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega &= \sigma_\omega^{(1)} * \tau^{(1)} * \rho^{(2)} * \sigma_\omega^{(2)} * \tau^{(2)} * \rho^{(3)} * \sigma_\omega^{(3)} * \tau^{(3)} * \cdots * \sigma_\omega^{(l-1)}, \\ |\omega| &= q,\ \ \sigma_\omega^{(i)} \in H_i^*,\ \ (\sigma_\omega^{(i)})_{|\sigma^{(i)}|} = a_i,\ \rho^{(i)} \in \mathcal{A}_i,\ \ 1 \le i \le l-1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

For every $q \le l_{1k} - N - 1$ and $\omega \in E_q$, we have $p_{\omega * \tau^{(l-1)}} c^r_{\omega * \tau^{(l-1)}} \ge \underline{\eta}_r^k$; otherwise the minimal length of words in $\Lambda_{k,r}$ would be less than l_{1k}, which contradicts the definition of l_{1k}. Thus, for all $q \le l_{1k} - N - 1$ and $\omega \in E_q$, there exist a finite maximal antichain $D_q(\omega)$ in $H_l^*(b_l)$ such that $\omega * \tau^{(l)} * \sigma \in \Lambda_{k,r}$ for all $\sigma \in D_q(\omega)$. Write

$$F_q := \{\omega * \tau^{(l)} * \sigma \in \Lambda_{k,r} : \omega \in E_q, \sigma \in D_q(\omega)\}.$$

Thus, for $q \le l_{1k} - N - 1$, we have $F_q \subset \Lambda_{k,r}(H_1, \ldots, H_l)$. Set

$$J_{k,r} := \bigcup_{q=3lN}^{l_{1k}-N-1} F_q.$$

Let $I_{k,r}^{(2)}$ denote the set of all vectors $(\sigma^{(1)}, \ldots, \sigma^{(l-1)})$ such that for some word $\gamma = \omega * \tau^{(l)} * \sigma \in J_{k,r}$, we have $\sigma_\omega^{(i)} = \sigma^{(i)}, 1 \le i \le l-1$.

Next, we show (3.13) holds. First we note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l-1} |\tau^{(i)}| + \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} \max_{\rho^{(i)} \in \mathcal{A}_i} |\rho^{(i)}| < 2lN.$$

Let $q_i, 1 \le i \le l-1$, be as defined in (3.9)-(3.10). We allocate a total length $l_{1k} - 3lN - 1$ among $\sigma^{(i)}, 1 \le i \le l$:

(i) $\sigma^{(1)}$ is allowed to starts at all $j \in H_1$ and terminates at $a_1 \in H_1$; the quantity $p_1 := |\sigma^{(1)}| - N$ can take values: $0, \dots, q_1$;

(ii) for every $j \in H_2$, $j * \sigma^{(2)}$ initiates at j and terminates at $a_2 \in H_2$; and $p_2 := |\sigma^{(2)}| - N$ can take values $0, \dots, q_2$;

(iii) for every $j \in H_i$, $j * \sigma^{(i)}$ initiates at j and terminates at $a_i \in H_i$; $p_i := |\sigma^{(i)}| - N$ can have values $0, \dots, q_i, 1 \le i \le l-1$.

For $\sigma^{(i)}, 1 \le i \le l-1$, satisfying (i)-(iii) and ω as defined in (3.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned}(l-1)N \le |\omega| &= \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} |\tau^{(i)}| + \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} |\rho^{(i)}| + \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} |\sigma^{(i)}| \\ &\le 2(l-1)N + (l_{1k} - 2lN - 1) \\ &= l_{1k} - 2N - 1.\end{aligned}$$

In addition, we have $\omega|_{|\omega|} = a_{l-1}$. Hence, such an ω belongs to E_q with $q \le l_{1k} - N - 1$. Thus, the set of $(\sigma^{(1)}, \dots, \sigma^{(l-1)})$ for which (i)-(iii) are satisfied is a subset of $I^{(2)}_{k,r}$. Using this fact and Lemmas 3.2 and 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}A_{k,r} : &= \sum_{(\sigma^{(1)},\dots,\sigma^{(l-1)}) \in I^{(2)}_{k,r}} \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} \sum_{j \in H_i} (p_{j*\sigma^{(i)}} c^r_{j*\sigma^{(i)}})^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} \\ &\ge \sum_{p_1=0}^{q_1} \sum_{j \in H_1} c^{(p_1+N)}_{ja_1}(H_1) \cdots \sum_{p_{l-1}=0}^{q_{l-1}} \sum_{j \in H_{l-1}} c^{(p_{l-1}+N)}_{ja_{l-1}}(H_{l-1}) \\ &\ge C_1^{l-1} \sum_{p_1=0}^{q_1} \sum_{p_2=0}^{q_2} \cdots \sum_{p_{l-1}=0}^{q_{l-1}} 1 \gtrsim k^{l-1}. \qquad (3.15)\end{aligned}$$

For fixed $\omega \in E_q$ with $q \le l_{1k} - N - 1$, we have

$$D_q(\omega) := \{\sigma \in H_l^*(b_l) : \omega * \tau^{(l)} * \sigma \in \Lambda_{k,r}\}.$$

Then $D_q(\omega)$ is a finite maximal antichain in $H_l^*(b_l)$. By (2.8), we have

$$\sum_{\sigma \in D_q(\omega)} (p_\sigma c^r_\sigma)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} \ge M_0. \qquad (3.16)$$

Note that $|j * \rho^{(i+1)}(j)| \le N$ for all $j \in H_i$ and $1 \le i \le l$. We have

$$\min_{1 \le i \le l} (p_{\tau^{(i)}} c^r_{\tau^{(i)}})^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}, \ \min_{\rho^{(i)} \in A_i} (p_{\rho^{(i)}} c^r_{\rho^{(i)}})^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} \ge \underline{\eta}_r^{\frac{Ns_r}{s_r+r}}. \qquad (3.17)$$

By our construction, $\Lambda_{k,r}(H_1, \cdots, H_l)$ contains words of the following form:

$$\sigma^{(1)} * \tau^{(1)} * \rho^{(2)} * \sigma^{(2)} * \tau^{(2)} * \rho^{(3)} * \sigma^{(3)} * \tau^{(3)} * \cdots * \sigma^{(l-1)} * \tau^{(l-1)} * \sigma^{(l)}.$$

For such words γ, by (3.17), we have

$$(p_\gamma c^r_\gamma)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} \ge \underline{\eta}_r^{\frac{2Nls_r}{s_r+r}} (p_{\sigma^{(l)}} c^r_{\sigma^{(l)}})^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} (p_{\sigma^{(i)}} c^r_{\sigma^{(i)}})^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}.$$

For a fixed $(\sigma^{(1)},\ldots,\sigma^{(l-1)})\in I^{(2)}_{k,r}$, we denote by $J_{k,r}(\sigma^{(1)},\ldots,\sigma^{(l-1)})$ the set of corresponding words γ in $J_{k,r}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\gamma\in J_{k,r}(\sigma^{(1)},\ldots,\sigma^{(l-1)})}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\\ &\geq \underline{\eta}_r^{\frac{2Nls_r}{s_r+r}}\prod_{i=1}^{l-1}\sum_{j\in H_i}(p_{j*\sigma^{(i)}}c_{j*\sigma^{(i)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\sum_{\sigma^{(l)}\in D_q(\omega)}(p_{\sigma^{(l)}}c_{\sigma^{(l)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\\ &\geq M_0\underline{\eta}_r^{\frac{2Nls_r}{s_r+r}}\prod_{i=1}^{l-1}\sum_{j\in H_i}(p_{j*\sigma^{(i)}}c_{j*\sigma^{(i)}}^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}.\end{aligned}$$

Using this and (3.15), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{k,r}((H_i)_{i=1}^l) &\geq \sum_{\gamma\in J_{k,r}}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\\ &\geq \sum_{(\sigma^{(1)},\ldots,\sigma^{(l-1)})\in I^{(2)}_{k,r}}\ \sum_{\gamma\in J_{k,r}(\sigma^{(1)},\ldots,\sigma^{(l-1)})}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\\ &\geq M_0\underline{\eta}_r^{\frac{2Nls_r}{s_r+r}}A_{k,r}\\ &\gtrsim l_{1k}^{l-1}\asymp k^{l-1}.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\Lambda_{k,r}$ be as defined in (2.1). We have*

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\Lambda_{k,r}}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\asymp k^{T_r-1}.$$

Proof. For $0\leq l\leq T_r$, we write

$$\Lambda_{k,r}(l):=\{\gamma\in\Lambda_{k,r}:T_r(\gamma)=l\}.$$

Then $\Lambda_{k,r}(0)$ is a subset of F^*. We have

$$\Lambda_{k,r}(l)=\bigcup_{(H_1,\ldots,H_l)\in\mathcal{H}_l}\Lambda_{k,r}(H_1,\ldots,H_l).$$

By Lemma 2.3 and Proposition 3.9 of [7], there exists a constant M_4 which is independent of k, such that

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\Lambda_{k,r}(0)}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}+\sum_{\gamma\in\Lambda_{k,r}(1)}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\leq M_4.$$

This, together with (3.1) and Lemmas 3.1, 2.1, yields

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\gamma\in\Lambda_{k,r}}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} &= M_4+\sum_{l=2}^{T_r}\sum_{\gamma\in\Lambda_{k,r}(l)}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\\ &\lesssim \sum_{l=2}^{T_r}\binom{T_r}{l}l_{2k}^{l-1}\lesssim l_{2k}^{T_r-1}\asymp k^{T_r-1}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Lemmas 3.3, 2.1, we have

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\Lambda_{k,r}}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} = \sum_{l=0}^{T_r}\sum_{\gamma\in\Lambda_{k,r}(l)}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} \gtrsim \sum_{l=2}^{T_r} l_{1k}^{l-1} \asymp k^{T_r-1}.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

With the above preparations, we are now able to prove our main result.

Proof of Theorem 1.1

By (2.1) and Lemmas 3.4, 2.1, we have

$$\phi_{k,r}\underline{\eta}_r^{\frac{ks_r}{s_r+r}} \asymp \sum_{\gamma\in\Lambda_{k,r}}(p_\gamma c_\gamma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}} \asymp k^{T_r-1} \asymp (\log\phi_{k,r})^{T_r-1}.$$

It follows that $\underline{\eta}_r^{\frac{kr}{s_r+r}} \asymp \phi_{k,r}^{-\frac{r}{s_r}}(\log\phi_{k,r})^{\frac{r(T_r-1)}{s_r}}$. This, together with (2.2), implies

$$\begin{aligned} e^r_{\phi_{k,r},r}(\mu) &\asymp \sum_{\sigma\in\Lambda_{k,r}} p_\sigma c_\sigma^r = \sum_{\sigma\in\Lambda_{k,r}}(p_\sigma c_\sigma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}(p_\sigma c_\sigma^r)^{\frac{r}{s_r+r}} \\ &\le \sum_{\sigma\in\Lambda_{k,r}}(p_\sigma c_\sigma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\underline{\eta}_r^{\frac{kr}{s_r+r}} \\ &\asymp \phi_{k,r}^{-\frac{r}{s_r}}(\log\phi_{k,r})^{(T_r-1)(1+\frac{r}{s_r})}. \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality with exponent less than one, we have

$$e^r_{\phi_{k,r},r}(\mu) \ge \left(\sum_{\sigma\in\Lambda_{k,r}}(p_\sigma c_\sigma^r)^{\frac{s_r}{s_r+r}}\right)^{\frac{s_r+r}{s_r}}\phi_{k,r}^{-\frac{r}{s_r}} \asymp \phi_{k,r}^{-\frac{r}{s_r}}(\log\phi_{k,r})^{(T_r-1)(1+\frac{r}{s_r})}.$$

For $n\ge\phi_{1,r}$, there exists a unique k such that $\phi_{k,r}\le n<\phi_{k+1,r}$. As is showed in the proof of Lemma 2.1 of [7], we have $\phi_{k,r}\asymp\phi_{k+1,r}$. Thus,

$$e^r_{n,r}(\mu)\begin{cases} \le e^r_{\phi_{k,r},r}(\mu)\lesssim n^{-\frac{r}{s_r}}(\log n)^{(T_r-1)(1+\frac{r}{s_r})} \\ \ge e^r_{\phi_{k+1,r},r}(\mu)\gtrsim n^{-\frac{r}{s_r}}(\log n)^{(T_r-1)(1+\frac{r}{s_r})} \end{cases}.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.

References

[1] J. A. Bucklew and G.L. Wise, Multidimensional asymptotic quantization with rth power distortion measures IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **28** (1982) 239-247.

[2] G. A. Edgar and R. D. Mauldin, Multifractal decompositions of digraph recursive fractals. Proc. London Math. Soc. **65** (1992) 604-628

[3] S. Graf and H. Luschgy, Foundations of quantization for probability distributions. Lecture Notes in Math. vol. **1730**, Springer, 2000

[4] S. Graf and H. Luschgy, The quantization dimension of self-similar probabilities. Math. Nachr. **241** (2002) 103-109

[5] S. Graf and H. Luschgy, Quantization for probability measures with respect to the geometric mean error. Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **136** (2004) 687-717

[6] R. Gray and D. Neuhoff, Quantization. IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **44** (1998) 2325-2383

[7] M. Kesseböhmer and S. Zhu, The upper and lower quantization coefficient for Markov-type measures Math. Nachr., in press, arXiv:1406.3257.

[8] W. Kreitmeier, Optimal quantization for dyadic homogeneous Cantor distributions. Math. Nachr. **281** (2008) 1307-1327

[9] L. J. Lindsay, Quantization dimension for probability distributions. Ph.D. Thesis, University of North Texas, 2001.

[10] R. D. Mauldin and S. C. Williams, Hausdorff dimension Graph-directed constructions. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **309** (1988) 811-829
[11] K. Pötzelberger, The quantization dimension of distributions. Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **131** (2001) 507-519
[12] P. L. Zador, Development and evaluation of procedures for quantizing multivariate distributions. Ph.D. Thesis, Stanford University, 1964.

School of Mathematics and Physics, Jiangsu University of Technology,, Changzhou 213001, China
E-mail address: sgzhu@jsut.edu.cn